```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
                      IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 7
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 8
 9
    RAJ CHRISTOPHER GUPTA,
10
                                             2:00-cv-1095-GEB-GGH-P
                         Plaintiff,
11
                                             RESPONSE TO
                                              DEFENDANTS' NOTICE RE
              v.
                                              QUALIFIED IMMUNITY
12
    C.A. TERHUNE, et al.,
13
                         Defendants.
14
15
              Defendants' "Notice of Withdrawal of Issue of Qualified
16
17
    Immunity From Jury" filed April 25, 2006, fails to show awareness of
18
    the Ninth Circuit decision in Acosta v. City and County of San
    Francisco, 83 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 1996), which states:
19
20
    "Regardless of who makes the ultimate determination as to qualified
21
    immunity, the jury, not the judge, must decide the disputed
22
    'foundational' or 'historical' facts that underlie the determination."
23
    Since no trial document has been proposed for the jury to decide
24
    factual issues applicable to the defense, it appears that each
25
    Defendant is on the brink of having the defense deemed waived.
26
    Dated: May 4, 2006
27
                                   /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
28
                                   GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
                                   United States District Judge
```